



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,478	06/14/2001	Geoffrey Howard Blackham	GJ-223J 7893	
75	590 10/07/2004		EXAMINER	
Iandiorio & Teska			LIU, MING HUN	
260 Bear Hill R Waltham, MA			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
***************************************	02.01.1010		2675	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/881,478	BLACKHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ming-Hun Liu	2675	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 31 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	/ to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	è	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content o	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amo he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final of the	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S .
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		•	
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by ti	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:		DOWN CHOW RIMARY EXAMINER	$w\sim$

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In reference to claim 11, the Thomas reference teaches the idea of a combination of a low frame and high frame rate projection. Thomas' reference can be easily modified to resemble the claimed invention by including another low frame rate projector. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to add a second projector if a wider spread of background coverage was required in the invention. The applicant's arguments concerning the specifics of the claimed invention is not supported by the actual limitations as outlined by the claim. The references anticipate the invention as outlined in the claim and as it is described in the specifications.